28

1	
2	
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5	OAKLAND DIVISION
6	
7	CHARLES D. AIRY,
8	Petitioner, No. C 11-1007 PJH (PR)
9	vs. ORDER EXTENDING TIME
10	KATHLEEN L. DICKINSON, Warden,
11	Respondent.
12	
13	This is a habeas case filed pro se by a state prisoner. In the initial review order the
14	court ordered respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted.
15	Respondent moved to dismiss on grounds that the petition was second or successive.
16	Petitioner then pointed out that the first petition to which respondent referred was not his,
17	but was his father's, who also is a state prisoner. Respondent has withdrawn the motion to
18	dismiss and requested additional time to answer the order to show cause.
19	The motion for an extension of time is <b>GRANTED</b> . The time for respondent to show
20	cause is <b>EXTENDED</b> to a date thirty days from the date this order is entered.
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.
22	Dated: September 20, 2011.  PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
23	United States District Judge
24	
25	
26	
27	

P:\PRO-SE\PJH\HC.11\AIRY1007.EXT-ans.wpd